REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed September 17, 2009 (hereinafter "Office Action"). Applicants have endeavored to place the application in immediate condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 4–7, 9, 10, 18, 19, and 25 were allowed in the Office Action. Claims 11–17 and 20–23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent No. 6,134,246, to Cai (hereinafter "Cai"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,963,570, to Agarwal2 (hereinafter "Agarwal2"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,819,658, to Agarwal et al. (hereinafter "Agarwal").

By this amendment, independent Claims 11, 15, 19, 22, and 23 have been amended, Claims 26–29 have been canceled, and new Claims 30–33 have been added. Thus, Claims 1, 2, 4–7, 9–23, 25, and 30–33 are currently pending in this application.

For reasons discussed below, applicants respectfully submit that this amendment is proper for entry after final and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Ahmed for his time and consideration provided over the course of a telephone interview with applicant's representative held on October 16, 2009. The interview focused principally on the independent claims and the distinctions between the claimed invention and the applied art of record. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments will likely obviate the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. Examiner Ahmed invited applicants to submit the proposed claim amendments for consideration.

Claims 11-17 and 20-23 Are Patentable Over Cai, Agarwal2, and Agarwal

While applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection of Claims 11–17 and 20–23, applicants have amended Claims 11, 15, 22, and 23 to be commensurate in scope with amendments made to independent Claim I, which has been allowed.

More specifically, the features of "extracting," "determining the mode of operation," and "decompressing" have been moved from Claims 11, 15, 22, and 23 to new dependent Claims 30-33, just as similar "extracting" and "decompressing" features that were previously recited in Claim 1 were moved to dependent Claim 25. Furthermore, Claims 11, 15, 22, and 23 have been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter recited in Claims 26-29, respectively. Consequently, Claims 26-29 have been canceled.

Because Claims 11, 15, 22, and 23, as amended, recite the allowable subject matter of former Claims 26–29 and because the elements recited in Claims 11, 15, 22, and 23 are commensurate with those recited in allowed Claim 1, amended Claims 11, 15, 22, and 23 are submitted to be in immediate condition for allowance.

Furthermore, because Claims 12–14 and 20 depend from Claim 11, and Claims 16, 17, and 21 depend from Claim 15, which are submitted as being allowable, Claims 12–14, 16, 17, 20, and 21 are also in condition for allowance. In addition, Claims 12–14, 16, 17, 20, and 21 are allowable for the additional subject matter that they recite.

The dependency of allowed Claim 19 was amended to ensure proper antecedent basis for "the mode of operation," as claimed.

Claims 30-33 Present Patentable Subject Matter

As indicated above, dependent Claims 30–33 have been added, but do not introduce new subject matter as they merely recite features that were previously presented in Claims 11, 15, 22, and 23, respectively. Accordingly, for at least their dependence on allowable Claims 11, 15, 22, and 23, and for the additional subject matter that they recite, Claims 30–33 are submitted as being in immediate condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested. If any questions remain, applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESSPILIC

Value han

Vladimir Raskin, Ph.D. Registration No. 62,771

Direct Dial No. 206.695,1799

VXR:kjb